More Mid-East Revelations Inside

Our Ambassador Explains Saud's Slaves Are Only Negroes and "Just Like Part of The Family," Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 8 FEBRUARY 25, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Sanctions for Israel, Bombers for Arabia

In the Senate the other day Humphrey of Minnesota said the pervading atmosphere in Washington was "characterized by the Administration's insistence upon using ambiguous and generalized appeals, dramatically presented by the President and self-righteously defended by the Secretary of State." Though Senator Humphrey was talking of the way the Mid-East resolution had been presented, he could have been describing the TV appearance in which Mr. Eisenhower summoned Israel to surrender or face sanctions.

The President's general moral propositions were unassailable, but his presentation of the facts was inadequate. The public and perhaps the President himself are not getting a candid picture of what we really have been doing in the Middle Eastern crisis. I want to tell a documented story no newspaper had yet printed as we went to press on the morning of Thursday, February 21, to illustrate just how uninformed Secretary of State Dulles manages to keep the country.

Remember the Desert "Impassible" to Tanks?

The story begins a year ago February 16 when the Liberian flag freighter James Monroe in Brooklyn was discovered to be loading 18 M-41 Walker Bulldog tanks for Saudi Arabia. The news created an uproar and brought about a Senate investigation because the Administration had been refusing requests for arms from Israel on the ground that it was seeking to prevent an arms race in the area. Secretary Dulles was summoned before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His efforts to explain were ingenious. When Senator Smith of New Jersey asked why "if we send tanks to Saudi Arabia" we should not send "corresponding equipment" to Israel, Mr. Dulles replied that the State Department did not think "the problem of Israel and its Arab neighbors" involved "because things like tanks cannot get across the desert." Apparently Mr. Dulles had never heard of El Alamein.

Now imagine the uproar if it had become known at the time that we had also sent nine B-26 bombers to Arabia. There would have been no question that these could "get across the desert." Just a few of those B-26's would be enough to make a shambles of Tel Aviv.

The evidence that we *have* sent 9 B-26's has been available here to the Senate since February 6 and to the press since Sunday, February 17. It appeared when there was released for publication the heavily censored transcript of executive session testimony taken by the joint Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee on the Mid-East resolution.

On page 644, in the second volume of those hearings, Senator Russell of Georgia was questioning George Wadsworth, our Ambassador to Saudi Arabia. Senator Russell seems to have been as misinformed as the rest of us. He observed quite incorrectly as it turned out, that Ibn Saud "has no military air, I believe." This elicited a reply from the Ambassador which is marked deleted at two points for security reasons. But in the part which was not deleted one will see that he revealed that we had sent Ibn Saud nine B-26s "in the course of the last three years."

Last Year The Information Was "Classified"

This information would have created a sensation last year, when the 18 tanks were pictured as an isolated and unimportant shipment. Senator Morse almost succeeded then in eliciting the information from the wily Mr. Dulles, who puts Ulysses in the shade. Senator Morse asked the Secretary at last year's hearing if we had sent any military aircraft to Saudi Arabia. The Secretary's way of replying was curious. His first answer was that we had sent "some shipments . . . but no jets." When Morse then wanted to know whether these were fighters or bombers, the Secretary replied that he believed they were only cargo planes but reserved "the right to correct the record if necessary."

Perhaps the Secretary thought the matter would be forgotten—as it was—before the record was printed. When I went over to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a few days later and asked whether any corrections had in fact been made by the Secretary before the transcript was sent to the printer, I learned that Mr. Dulles had changed it to read, "We have sold a very limited number of military aircraft of the propellor type." (See the *Weekly* of last March 5, or page 68 of the printed record of the Senate hearing. No newspaper but the *New York Post* paid any attention to the story at the time). There was a rumor then that some four to six B-26 bombers had been sent Saudi Arabia, but when the press officer of the State Department was asked whether fighters or bombers were among those "propellor type" planes, he said the information was "classified."

Will Saud Get Jet Bombers Next?

Every detail of this can be checked from the public record. It shows how easily the Department gets away with its own one-sided presentation of the facts. The story is also important in another respect. What were in the deletions of the Wadsworth testimony? He said we were now working on a plan "which would double the size of the army and strengthen the air force" of Saudi Arabia. Is Ibn Saud to get jets now instead of just "propellor type" bombers? How does the Department reconcile this—and indeed the new multi-million dollar arms aid provisions of the Mid-East resolution—with the UN arms embargo on the area, and with the agreement by which Saudi Arabia placed its armed forces under Egyptian command last April 21? How against this background can the public judge, how can Israel trust, Mr. Dulles' assurances?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the 1,000 Pages of Senate Committee Testimony on the Mid-East Resolution

Despite Heavy Deletions for "Security" Some Vivid Insights into Policy

Last week-end the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services released almost 1,000 pages of testimony taken in public and executive session on the President's Mid-East resolution. These were covered inadequately by the daily papers, which looked at them hurriedly for "news." At moments, however, in prolonged and repetitive interrogation of officials accustomed to slippery reply, the Senators succeeded in obtaining vivid insights into the policies and personalities involved. On these two pages, as indispensable background for the debate in the Senate and the sanctions controversy in the UN, we present the most important of these for our readers.—IFS.

No Evidence of Soviet Aggression

Senator FULBRIGHT. Mr. Secretary, is there any significant new evidence that the Soviet Union is planning a direct aggression in the general area of the Middle East?

Secretary DULLES. There is no evidence that we are aware of. (p. 25)

Langer Did Not Press The Question

Senator LANGER. I want to ask you, first of all, whether your firm represents or did represent any oil companies in the Far (sic) East?

Secretary DULLES. You are referring to the firm that I was once a partner of?

Senator LANGER. Yes; the firm you used to be connected with.

Secretary DULLES. I retired from it in 1949.

Senator LANGER. Yes. But does your firm, the firm you used to be with?

Secretary DULLES. You say "my firm". I have no firm at the present time, Senator. You mean the firm from which I retired in 1949?

Senator LANGER. That is right.

Secretary DULLES. I think that they may. (p. 103)

Unsympathetic to the Oil Companies

"I sometimes feel, with the oil companies, that you are a little unsympathetic, in your hearings, to their interests."

—Hon. Geo. Wadsworth, U. S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Mid-East Hearing. (p. 638)

Just A Question of Wording

Senator MANSFIELD. Under this resolution, do we propose to reward Syria and Egypt with economic and military aid?

Secretary DULLES. No, sir. That question and answer might be subject to misconstruction unless I elaborate a little bit.

Senator MANSFIELD. All right.

Secretary DULLES. You say "reward" them. Certainly we do not intend to reward them with economic aid. I do not exclude the possibility that under certain circumstances they might get economic aid. I do not mean my answer to indicate they would necessarily be barred.

Senator MANSFIELD. What you mean, Mr. Secretary, is that you do not agree with the use of the word "reward"?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir. (p. 114)

Still the Instant Retaliation Policy

Senator MANSFIELD. Is this proposal the reiteration of the 1954 policy of instant retaliation at places and by means of our own choosing?

Secretary DULLES. It still remains a basic policy of the United States that if war is forced upon us, we will not necessarily confine hostilities to the places that the enemy picks. (p. 118)

Let's Not Be Crude About Sanctions

Senator Sparkman. Am I not correct in my understanding that there is outstanding a long-time resolution of the United Nations forbidding Egypt to close the canal to Israel?

Mr. [Jefferson] Caffery [former U. S. Ambassador to Egypt]. There is such a resolution.

Senator Sparkman. Have we ever invoked economic sanctions against Egypt for refusing to abide by that UN resolution?

Mr. Caffery. No, we have not.

Senator Sparkman. Just how do we reconcile our position? To me it seems absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. Caffery. Inconsistent, yes, but perhaps practical. . . .

Senator Sparkman. It is practical because we can't make Egypt obey and we can make Israel, is that right?

Mr. Caffery. I would not put it quite that crudely. (p. 802)

Inviting the Arabs to Attack Israel?

Senator MORSE. Would you agree, Mr. Secretary, to an amendment which provided that if arms are used by the Arabs against Israel or vice versa we would intervene?

Secretary DULLES. No; I do not think that this resolution is an appropriate place to deal with that problem, Senator . . .

Senator MORSE. You ship these arms into the Arab States or into Israel . . . and we may find ourselves providing them with the very sinews for war in the Middle East that could very well lead to a third world war. Is that not a possibility?

Secretary DULLES. That is a possibility. . . .

Senator MORSE. Well, one of the alleged purposes of this resolution is . . . to reduce the possibility of war. Would not some such language as I propose make it clear to the Arab States and to Israel that if they follow any warlike activity, we will intervene, and likewise help to preserve the peace?

Secretary DULLES. I would think it was wiser here to follow the precedent that was set in the Southeast Asia Security Treaty. There the United States made clear . . . that the only armed aggression with which we were concerned . . . was Communist-armed aggression. (pps. 151-2)

Won't Take Arms Unless They Can Use Them Against Israel?

Senator MORSE. Russia is doing a great deal of propagandizing work in the Arab States to stir up animosity between the Arab States and Israel, and apparently to indicate that in some instances she would be helpful to an Arab State in wiping Israel off the map as a State. . . . I am briefly asking whether you think if we put the language I proposed in the resolution, namely, that we would intervene in case of a war within the Middle East, that would cause some Arab States to look upon the resolution with less favor as far as their cooperation is concerned?

Secretary DULLES. With less favor?

Senator MORSE. Yes.

Secretary DULLES. I think it probably would, yes. (pps. 152-3)

What Does Dulles Mean by "Free Nations"?

Senator MORSE. Mr. Secretary, in many of your statements that I have read, and also the President's speech, the phrase is used over and over again, "The free nations of the Middle East." Would you name for the committee the nations of the Middle East that are free nations. . . .

Secretary DULLES. The words 'free nations' used I am sure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Ervin: "Wouldn't We Be Taking The Side of the Government Against The People?"

Dulles: We Are Helping to Maintain Law and Order All Around the World

by the President, and whenever I used them, I used them not to describe the internal freedoms of the people, but whether or not the nation itself is free from foreign domination. . . . I think that all of the Middle Eastern countries today are free. None of them are Soviet satellites or run by international communism. . . .

Senator MORSE. How many of these states that we seek to protect under this resolution are free in the sense that you have just used the term, democratically free, in that they have parliamentary governments, bills of rights, and are free from a local government that could be classed as totalitarian?

Secretary DULLES. I do not believe, Senator, that there are many, if any states in the area which would measure quite up to what your and my ideals are in the respect. (pps. 154-5)

In Fact We Might Even Help Keep Despots in Power

Senator SYMINGTON. But, if necessary, you would support a police force in a country to keep down an uprising that you thought was wrong. Is that correct?

Secretary DULLES. If we felt that a country was unable by its own resources to maintain the security forces necessary for internal order and prevent Communist subversion, then we would consider assisting them.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you do that even though it was fairly clear a majority of the people wanted the government you did not want?

Secretary DULLES. You mean that most of the people wanted Communism.

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes.

Secretary DULLES. Well, that is such a remote contingency that it is hardly worth answering, I think, Senator. There are no people in that part of the world who want Communism. (pps. 158-9)

Does Religion Guarantee Against Communism?

Senator SYMINGTON. I noticed you mentioned the religious aspect yesterday, in your testimony about Communism. It has always impressed me that a great country like Italy, with over 90 percent of the people Catholics, nevertheless has as perhaps its largest party the Communist party; so I do not see how we can be sure that they do not want Communism if it will improve their lot in a country, say, like Syria.

Secretary DULLES. Most of the people in Italy who vote the Communist ticket do not do so because they are Communists or want Italy to go Communist. They do that because that is a vehicle for registering a protest against conditions as they are. It is not really a desire to have communism. (p. 159)

Helping the Rulers Against the People

Senator ERVIN. So that would put us having Uncle Sam sticking his nose in all of the nations of the Middle East in order to maintain the status quo; would it not? And if that would not mess us up in Arab politics, what would it do?

Secretary DULLES. I think that to maintain a government which is strong enough not to be overthrown by subversion is not to become involved in Arab politics.

Senator ERVIN. Well, it certainly is taking the side of that government against the side of the people of that country which do not want that government; is it not?

Secretary DULLES. I think to maintain security forces, to maintain law and order in the country, is something which is entirely appropriate for us to assist in. We are doing that all around the world. . . .

We Might Even Aid Nasser to Stay in Power

Senator ERVIN. You are not proposing, are you, to go in there and use some of this aid to strengthen Nasser's internal forces, his internal security forces, are you? . . .

Secretary DULLES. We have no *present* plans to do that; no. . . .

Senator ERVIN. Well, you are not at liberty to give me an assurance that the American taxpayers will not be supporting the Nasser government within a few months if we pass this resolution in its present form; are you?

Secretary DULLES. No, sir; I cannot give you any assurance as to what will be done. (pps. 345-6)

Nasser As Sphinx

Senator HUMPHREY. Did we tolerate vicious attacks against our aid to Egypt in the Government-controlled and censored press, without effective protest? . . .

Mr. [Henry A] BYROADE [then U. S. Ambassador to Egypt]. I protested officially and discussed it with him many times.

Senator HUMPHREY. What was his reaction?

Mr. BYROADE. I never could quite fathom that. [Deleted.] (p. 745)

Our Well Informed Ambassadors

Senator Fulbright. Did the State Department ask your advice before announcing the so-called Eisenhower doctrine?

Mr. [George] Wadsworth [U. S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia]. No, Senator.

Senator Fulbright. Had you heard about it?

Mr. Wadsworth. I heard of it first through the United Press and then over BBC. [British Broadcasting Company]. (p. 659)

Senator Fulbright. Did you learn about the Aswan dam offer cancellation from the Department, or did you read about it in the press?

Mr. [Henry A.] Byroade [then U. S. Ambassador to Egypt]. I first read it in the press, sir. (p. 717)

Our Ambassador Explains Those Slaves Are Only Negroes and Part of The Family

Mr. [Geo.] Wadsworth [U. S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia]. Now, slavery is recognized as an institution by Islam, but it is not approved. . . . The institution has existed, it is recognized. It is deplored—that may perhaps be too strong a word—but the idea was that it would gradually die out. . . . If a child is born to a slave mother from a freeman, that child is free. If a child is born to a slave father, that child is born a slave.

Now, where are they born, into what kind of slavery? It is domestic slavery only. These people are a very democratic people. . . . In many of the great families, the servants carry the name of the family and are treated as members of the family and take pride in their service.

Senator Fulbright. Tell me what is the actual difference in a family between one of the sons, as they seem to have a great many, and the slave? What is the difference in the way he is treated? Does he eat differently, does he have different quarters, and so on?

Mr. Wadsworth. Yes, he has different quarters. He works to earn his keep. . . . These fellows aren't exploited as, for example, many were in our cotton fields only a century ago. . . . Most of the slaves came from Africa. No Arab has ever been a slave.

Senator Fulbright. No. They are all Negroes, are they?

Mr. Wadsworth. Yes, as a general statement. [Further explanation deleted for security.] (pps. 670-1)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Germans Are Obsequious in Washington, But Getting Ready for A Change in Bonn

Arthur Miller and Dr. Otto Nathan Enter Our Own Crucible

We venture to predict that the House Un-American Activities Committee eventually will lose its contempt actions against Dr. Otto Nathan and Arthur Miller. The stated purpose of the hearing was to investigate the unauthorized use of U. S. passports. The two questions Miller declined to answer would have required him to identify other persons at a meeting of alleged Communist party writers in 1947. It is going to be difficult to convince the courts, at least on appeal, that these questions were relevant to the stated purpose of the hearing. In Dr. Nathan's case, the fact that in 1953 he had signed the "am not and never have been" affidavit required by the State Department for a passport may prove an obstacle to conviction. In his case, too, it will be difficult to demonstrate the relevance of the questions asked. Dr. Nathan will subpoena Chairman Walter in an effort to show that the Committee had no real legislative purpose and to challenge him to repeat defamatory statements made by Walter about Dr. Nathan at a House Judiciary subcommittee hearing last May. As Einstein's close friend and executor, Dr. Nathan is following Einstein's advice to American intellectuals, which was to defy the Congressional Inquisition, and refuse to submit to interrogation by its snoopers. Fundamentally these hearings are a form of psychological warfare; the purpose is to break the intellectuals morally by making them crawl, and turning them into informers. In resisting, Dr. Nathan and Mr. Miller deserve applause and support.

In Memory of Heywood Broun

Come Out and Demonstrate

The American Newspaper Guild recently dedicated a library here in Washington to the memory of Heywood Broun, its founder. But it defames his memory by its silence on an issue Broun would have fought — the newspapermen facing jail for refusing on First Amendment grounds to submit to the Senate Internal Security Committee. Indeed the New York local and national offices of the Guild have not even answered the letters from these witch hunt victims asking its aid. (If Broun were alive he'd be among the victims and the Guild wouldn't have the nerve to defend him.)

So really to honor Broun's memory, we invite newspapermen and our other readers to a meeting in the Hotel Woodstock, 127 W. 43rd St., New York City, next Friday night, March 1, at 8 p. m. to demonstrate solidarity with one of these victims, William Price, formerly of the New York Daily News, who goes on trial for contempt March 11. Murray Kempton of the New York Post, who carries on the Broun tradition, has agreed to speak. So will Price and I. Come out and make this a rousing demonstration of the kind we used to have in the old days before Americans acquired shadows, and began to walk in fear of them.—IFS.

In preparation for this year's West German election the Social Democratic leader, Herr Ollenhauer, has visited Washington to clear himself with the State Department. Mr. Dulles was revealing when he said at press conference last week, "Mr. Ollenhauer was gracious enough to seek my views . . . rather than try to impress me with his." Herr Ollenhauer must have listened dutifully. He held a press conference later the same day and said in effect that if the Social Democrats came to power they would not renegotiate unification without U. S. permission. The Germans will be less obsequious once they get an Army. Adenauer's Minister of Defense in a right wing Bonn weekly was explaining at the same time the "political meaning" of German rearmament and hinting at a return to a Bismarckian *"Machtpolitik"* (dealing from armed strength). Herr Strauss indicates that if Moscow's terms are satisfactory (return of the Oder-Neisse lands?) Germany might accept the status of an armed neutral. When U. S. reporters questioned Strauss about the article, he said it was just "theoretical." Presumably it will not become practical until after the U. S. has picked up the tab for German rearmament.

For an unusually good piece of reporting, scantily covered by the press, we recommend the report on Russia and Eastern Europe filed by Chairman Jamie L. Whitten (D. Miss.) of the House Appropriations subcommittee for the Agriculture Department. Whitten came back from an extensive trip last Fall impressed with the friendliness of the Russian people, the backwardness of the Soviet Union and the exaggerated conceptions of its strength built up by our own military. Whitten favors relaxed trade barriers and cultural exchange.

Help Us Reach More Readers With This Issue By Distributing Extra Copies To Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

2/25/57

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED